

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

DALE LESTER MORRIS, # 187452,

Petitioner,

v.

CIVIL NO. 2:16-CV-12531  
HONORABLE DENISE PAGE HOOD  
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

PAUL KLEE,

Respondent.

**OPINION AND ORDER SUMMARILY DISMISSING THE PETITION FOR  
WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AND DECLINING TO ISSUE A  
CERTIFICATE OF APPEALABILITY OR LEAVE TO APPEAL IN FORMA  
PAUPERIS**

Dale Lester Morris, (“Petitioner”), confined at the Gus Harrison Correctional Facility in Adrian, Michigan, filed a petition for writ of habeas corpus pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. In his application, filed *pro se*, petitioner challenges his conviction for two counts of bank robbery, M.C.L.A. 750.531a. For the reasons stated below, the petition for writ of habeas corpus is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**I. Background**

Petitioner was convicted of the above charges in the Washtenaw County Circuit Court. On May 18, 2016, petitioner was sentenced to five

years, eleven months to thirty years in prison. There is no indication that petitioner ever appealed his conviction to the Michigan Court of Appeals or to the Michigan Supreme Court. Petitioner now seeks a writ of habeas corpus, in which he challenges the validity of the arrest warrant and criminal complaint in his state criminal case.

## **II. Discussion**

The instant petition must be dismissed without prejudice, because petitioner has yet to exhaust his claims with the state courts.

A prisoner seeking federal habeas relief must first exhaust his or her available state court remedies before raising a claim in federal court. 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b) and (c); *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U. S. 270, 275-78 (1971); *See also Foster v. Withrow*, 159 F. Supp. 2d 629, 638 (E.D. Mich. 2001). Although exhaustion is not a jurisdictional matter, “it is a threshold question that must be resolved” before a federal court can reach the merits of any claim contained in a habeas petition. *See Wagner v. Smith*, 581 F. 3d 410, 415 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2009). Therefore, each claim must be reviewed by a federal court for exhaustion before any claim may be reviewed on the merits by a federal court. *Id.* In order to exhaust a claim for federal habeas review, a petitioner must present each ground to both state appellate courts, even

where the state's highest court provides only discretionary review. See *Regan v. Hoffner*, 209 F. Supp. 2d 703, 710, n. 3 (E.D. Mich. 2002)(citing *O'Sullivan v. Boerckel*, 526 U.S. 838, 845-47 (1999)). A federal district court should generally dismiss a petition for writ of habeas corpus that contains any unexhausted claims. See *Rose v. Lundy*, 455 U.S. 509, 510, 522, (1982); *Regan v. Hoffner*, 209 F. Supp. 2d at 710, n. 3. The failure to exhaust state court remedies may be raised *sua sponte* by a federal court. *Benoit v. Bock*, 237 F. Supp. 2d 804, 806 (E.D. Mich. 2003); 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(3).

A habeas petitioner has the burden of proving that he or she has exhausted his or her state court remedies. See *Rust v. Zent*, 17 F.3d 155, 160 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1994). Federal habeas corpus relief is unavailable to a state prisoner who fails to allege that he or she has exhausted his or her available state court remedies. See *Granville v. Hunt*, 411 F. 2d 9, 11 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 1969). The instant petition is subject to dismissal, because petitioner has failed to allege or indicate in his petition that he has exhausted his state court remedies. See *Peralta v. Leavitt*, 56 Fed. Appx. 534, 535 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cir. 2003); See also *Fast v. Wead*, 509 F. Supp. 744, 746 (N.D. Ohio 1981). Petitioner has filed a claim of appeal with the Washtenaw County

Circuit Court and appellate counsel has been appointed to represent him. No appeal has been filed yet, however, with the Michigan Court of Appeals or the Michigan Supreme Court.<sup>1</sup> Because petitioner has not presented his claims to the Michigan Court of Appeals or to the Michigan Supreme Court, he has not exhausted his state court remedies. See *Geeter v. Bouchard*, 293 F. Supp. 2d 773, 775 (E.D. Mich. 2003).

Petitioner has failed to exhaust his state court remedies with respect to his claims and still has an available state court remedy with which to do so. Although a district court has the discretion to stay a mixed habeas petition containing both exhausted and unexhausted claims to allow the petitioner to present his unexhausted claims to the state court in the first instance, See *Rhines v. Weber*, 544 U.S. 269 (2005), a stay of the petition is unnecessary in this case. The present habeas petition was filed with this Court before petitioner's conviction became final with the state courts pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2244(d)(1)(A). Because the one year limitations period has yet to begin running in this case, petitioner would not be

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court obtained this information from the Washtenaw County Circuit Court website, <http://tcweb.ewashtenaw.org/PublicAccess/CaseDetail.aspx?CaseID=354353>; <http://tcweb.ewashtenaw.org/PublicAccess/CaseDetail.aspx?CaseID=354355>; the Michigan Court of Appeals' website, <http://courts.mi.gov/opinions/orders>, and from Westlaw's website, [www.westlaw.com](http://www.westlaw.com). Public records and government documents, including those available from reliable sources on the Internet, are subject to judicial notice. See *United States ex. rel. Dingle v. BioPort Corp.*, 270 F. Supp. 2d 968, 972 (W.D. Mich. 2003). A federal district court is also permitted to take judicial notice of another court's website. See e.g. *Graham v. Smith*, 292 F. Supp. 2d 153, 155, n. 2 (D. Me. 2003).

prejudiced if his habeas petition was dismissed without prejudice during the pendency of his state court appeal. Thus, a stay of the proceedings is not necessary or appropriate to preserve the federal forum for petitioner's claims. See *Schroeder v. Renico*, 156 F. Supp. 2d 838, 845-46 (E.D. Mich. 2001).

The Court will also deny a certificate of appealability. In order to obtain a certificate of appealability, a prisoner must make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). To demonstrate this denial, the applicant is required to show that reasonable jurists could debate whether, or agree that, the petition should have been resolved in a different manner, or that the issues presented were adequate to deserve encouragement to proceed further. *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 483-84 (2000). When a district court denies a habeas petition on procedural grounds without reaching the prisoner's underlying constitutional claims, a certificate of appealability should issue, and an appeal of the district court's order may be taken, if the petitioner shows that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the petitioner states a valid claim of the denial of a constitutional right, and that jurists of reason would find it debatable whether the district court was correct in its procedural

ruling. *Id.* When a plain procedural bar is present and the district court is correct to invoke it to dispose of the case, a reasonable jurist could not conclude either that the district court erred in dismissing the petition or that the petition should be allowed to proceed further. In such a circumstance, no appeal would be warranted. *Id.* “The district court must issue or deny a certificate of appealability when it enters a final order adverse to the applicant.” Rules Governing § 2254 Cases, Rule 11(a), 28 U.S.C. foll. § 2254.

The Court declines to issue a certificate of appealability, because “jurists of reason” would not find it debatable whether this Court was correct in its procedural ruling that petitioner had failed to exhaust an available state court remedy with respect to his claim or claims. See *Colbert v. Tambi*, 513 F. Supp. 2d 927, 939 (S.D. Ohio 2007). The Court will also deny petitioner leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*, because the appeal would be frivolous. *Dell v. Straub*, 194 F. Supp. 2d 629, 659 (E.D. Mich. 2001).

### III. ORDER

Accordingly, the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.**

The Court further **DENIES** a certificate of appealability and leave to appeal *in forma pauperis*.

Dated: July 27, 2016

s/Denise Page Hood

HON. DENISE PAGE HOOD

CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE